

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1, 3-29, and 41-65 are pending in the application.

Claims 8-10, 16, 21, 22, 49-51, and 58 were withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner objected to claim 17.

Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 41, 44, 53, and 59-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chabria U.S. Patent No. 5,289,917 (hereinafter "Chabria").

Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 24, 15, 41, 44, 53, and 59-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boone U.S. Patent No. 4,870,764 (hereinafter "Boone").

Claims 3, 14, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabria.

Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabria in view of Saito U.S. Patent No. 5,607,101 (hereinafter "Saito").

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabria in view of Fine et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,438,878 (hereinafter "Fine") or Gregory-Gillman U.S. Patent No. 6,151,823 (hereinafter "Gregory-Gillman").

Claims 3, 14, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone.

Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Saito.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Fine or Gregory-Gillman.

Claims 4-7, 12-13, 26-29, 45-48, 55-57, 63, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Hirsch U.S. Patent No. 6,484,425 (hereinafter "Hirsch").

Claims 5, 28, 46, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Bordon U.S. Patent No. 5,197,213 (hereinafter "Bordon").

Summary of Applicants' Amendments

Applicants have cancelled claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 solely to expedite prosecution.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 24, 41, and 53 solely in order to expedite prosecution.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. Applicants reserve the right to claim any subject matter lost by any amendment or cancellation in one or more continuation or divisional applications.

Applicant's Response to the Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner objected to claim 17.

Applicant has cancelled claim 17 solely in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's objection of

claim 17 be withdrawn.

Applicant's Response to the
Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 have been cancelled solely in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 be withdrawn.

Applicant's Response to the
Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 41, 44, 53, and 59-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chabria.

Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 24, 15, 41, 44, 53, and 59-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boone.

Cahbria discusses a greeting card that includes a bubble that can be provided inside a greeting card. A flashlight can be placed in the bubble so that when a user opens a greeting card, the user is provided with the bubble having the flashlight. The bubble cannot allegedly be viewed until the greeting card is opened.

Boone discusses a greeting card that includes a cup. A user can allegedly open the greeting card and pour water into the cup so that the water can interface with a capsule.

Claims 1

Applicants have amended claim 1 solely in order to expedite prosecution. Applicants amended claim 1 includes a first containment sheet that is substantially flat and at least partially transparent as well as aligned with an aperture in a first sheet segment.

None of the references, used either alone or in combination, shows or suggests applicants invention as defined by applicants amended claim 1.

Chabria, for example, includes a bubble that can be allegedly utilized to hold a single flashlight. Boone, as per another example, includes a cup that can be allegedly utilized to hold a single capsule. Applicants invention of claim 1, however, includes a first containment sheet that is substantially flat and at least partially transparent as well as provided in the configuration included in claim 1.

In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejections of claim 1, and any claims dependent therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claim 24

Applicants have amended claim 24 solely in order to expedite prosecution. Applicants invention of amended claim 24 includes a special effects container that is viewable from the exterior surface of a greeting card through a containment sheet that is substantially flat.

None of the references, used either alone or in combination, shows or suggests applicants invention of amended claim 24 of a special effects container that is viewable from the exterior surface of a greeting card through a containment sheet that is substantially flat.

In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejections of claim 24, and any claims dependent therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 41 and 53

Applicants have amended claims 41 and 53 solely in order to expedite prosecution. Claims 41 and 53 are patentable for reasons similar to the reasons included above that claim 1 is patentable.

Accordingly, none of the references, utilized either alone or in combination show or suggest applicants inventions of claims 41 and 53. In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 41 and 53, and any claims dependent therefrom, be withdrawn.

Applicant's Response to the
Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3, 14, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabria. Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabria in view of Saito.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabria in view of Fine or Gregory-Gillman.

Claims 3, 14, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone.

Claims 17, 18, 52, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Saito.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Fine or Gregory-Gillman.

Claims 4-7, 12-13, 26-29, 45-48, 55-57, 63, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Hirsch.

Claims 5, 28, 46, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boone in view of Bordon.

As shown above, independent claims 1, 24, 41, and 53 are patentable. All of the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) depend from either patentable claim 1, 24, 41, or 53. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including the pending claims, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge the three-month extension of time fee, or charge any other fees associated with this filing, or credit any overpayment of the same, to Deposit Account No. 06-1075.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Jeffrey D. Mullen/

Jeffrey D. Mullen

Agent for Applicants

Registration No. 52,056

Fish & Neave IP Group

Ropes and Gray

Customer No. 1473

1251 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10020-1105

Tel.: (212) 596-9000